

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2010, this Amendment is being filed simultaneously with a Request for Continued Examination. Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-16 and 35-39 have been amended, claim 9 has been cancelled and claims 17-33 and 40-47 were previously cancelled. As a result, claims 1-8, 10-16 and 34-39 remain pending in this application. The allowance of claims 12 and 34-39 is noted and appreciated and only non substantive amendments have been made to claims 35-39.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and additions to the claims are fully supported by the specification, as originally filed, and that no new matter has been added. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Riggelman for the courtesies extended to their representatives, Steven E. Jedlinski and David M. Thimmig, during the telephonic interview conducted on March 25, 2011. The interview included discussions regarding the patentability of claims 1-11 and 13-16, with emphasis on independent claim 1, over the cited prior art (U.S. Patent No. 4,697,464 to *Martin* and U.S. Patent No. 4,706,158 to *Weber*). No agreement was reached during the interview. Applicants have provided support for the amendments sought herein.

Summary of Claim Rejections

In the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2010, the claims were rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Martin* in view of *Weber*;
- Claims 7 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Martin* in view of *Weber* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,040,950 to *Dalquist et al*;
- Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Martin* in view of *Weber* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,749,526 to *Laabs et al*; and
- Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Martin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,697,464 to *Teague* and further in view of *Weber*.

Discussion of Prior Art

Martin discloses a separate test panel 30 that is operably connected to a pressure washer 50. The test panel includes a plurality of gauges which may be viewed by the operator for displaying the value of sensed parameters. It is respectfully submitted that *Martin's* test panel itself has absolutely no diagnostic capabilities but rather simply displays the output values of sensed parameters on gauges. The user is then left to read, understand, and analyze the output measurements displayed on the gauges, and then must make judgments about the operation condition of the pressure washer. *Martin* is not integrated into the pressure washer unit for the convenience of the user and even notes that the test panel only enables analysis and does not actually provide analysis of the operating parameters of the washer. See Col. 6, lines 15-26.

Weber discloses an electrical device that automatically switches between operating conditions using an operational amplifier, but without notifying the user of any such change or condition of the electrical device. More specifically, the circuitry of *Weber* compares the input voltage level at the motor with preset high and low voltage thresholds, such as provided by adjustable resistors 188 and 194-1, in Fig. 4. If the voltage at the motor is too high or too low (block 34 in Fig.1), a thyristor switch "H" 44 is activated, or a thyristor switch "L" 48 is activated, to change the tap R1 or R2 on a field winding 22 of the motor 25. The electrical device lacks any display or indicator of an operation condition, i.e. high or low voltage condition, or even that the circuit of *Weber* has changed to a different tap on the field winding of the motor. Accordingly, the user of *Weber's* device has absolutely no knowledge of the presence or change in the operation of the electrical device.

Amended Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an electrical pressure washer which includes, in part, a housing containing an electrical motor, a diagnostic circuit and an indication panel wherein the indication panel comprises "a plurality of indicator lights that are connected to the diagnostic circuit, with each indicator light corresponding to a different operation condition and being adapted to be illuminated when the diagnostic circuit has determined that the respective operation condition is present." (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that neither *Martin* nor *Weber* discloses or suggests an electric pressure washer with such a diagnostic circuit and indication panel. In addition, Applicants have included in amended claim 1

that each operation amplifier determines a different operation condition of the pressure washer based on a comparison between a detected voltage over a return wire of the power cord and a correspond reference voltage. This is supported in the discussion within the Specification, more specifically in paragraphs [0018] – [0019] and [0021] – [0029] of the published application

It should be noted that, for certain operation conditions, the pressure washer utilizes a sensing wire as included in dependent claim 8 and claims 10 and 12 that depend further therefrom.

The advantages of having such a system for sensing and identifying operation conditions are discussed in paragraphs [0003] – [0008] and [0018] – [0019] of the published application. For example, such a system will notify a user that the water pressure is lower than usual because the unit is in a chemical suction mode rather than the unit simply being defective. Such a system built within the pressure washer itself helps limit returns and service calls.

As noted above, *Martin* is directed to an entirely separate test panel device that is to be attached to a pressure washer. The panel includes a plurality of gauges for displaying sensed parameters of an attached pressure washer on the ranges of the gauges. It is left to a user or operator of the pressure washer to read the gauges and make a determination as to the current operation condition of the pressure washer. The Office Action also recognizes that *Martin* lacks disclosing operational amplifiers and indicator lights.

For the operational amplifiers, the Office Action seeks to combine *Martin* with *Weber*'s disclosure of a single operational amplifier to identify a voltage level at a motor. However, *Weber* lacks any teaching of displaying the output of its operational amplifier in order to notify the user of the operation condition of an electrical device. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine *Weber* and *Martin* because *Weber* was not concerned with notifying the user of the output of the operational amplifier and *Martin* was only concerned with identifying and displaying values associated with a sensed parameter. There would have been no motivation to combine the teachings of these references, nor is there any suggestion that they could be successfully combined or that such a combination would provide a device as is claimed.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by *Martin* in view of *Weber*. Because dependent claims 2-8, 10-11 and 13-16 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and add further limitations thereto, each of these claims also

should be allowable. It is to be noted that Applicants reserve the right to traverse the rejections of these dependent claims separately, and in more detail, at a later time.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, in addition to the previously allowed claims 12 and 34-39, it is believed that claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13-16 also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

A petition and fee for a one (1) month extension of time are filed herewith. Applicants note that the RCE fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(e) is being submitted with the Request for Continued Examination Transmittal (Form PTO/SB/30EFS). It is believed that no other fees are due with this reply. However, if a fee should be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Cook Alex Ltd.'s Deposit Account No. 50-1039.

It is submitted that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 334-8579 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500
Customer No. 26568

Dated: March 28, 2011

/steven e. jedlinski/
Steven E. Jedlinski
Registration No. 66,922